(2)
(4)

C.S. 1001 — SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR
CHHATTISGARH
WRIT PETITION No. 4447 /2006
W.P.(S) /2006

PETITIONER : Byadha Lal Satnami S/o Mahettar Lal Satnami, Aged about 42 Years, R/o Village – Khajurani, Post – Khajurani, Tehsil – Jaijaipur Distt. – Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through – Collector, Janjgir
Distt. – Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)
2. The Additional Collector, Janjgir
Distt. – Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)
3. The Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue), Sakti,
Distt. Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)
4. The Tahsildar, Jaijaipur
Distt. – Jajngir-Champa (C.G.)
5. Rajesh Kumar S/o Rameshwar Lal Chandra, Aged about 27 years, R/o Village – Khajurani, Teh. Jaijaipur, Distt. - Janjgir – Champa (C.G.)
6. Naresh Kumar S/o Rameshwar Lal Chandra, Aged about - 24 Years, R/o Village – Khajurani, Teh. Jaijaipur, Distt. - Janjgir – Champa (C.G.)
7. Kushal Ram S/o Mannulal aged about 32 years R/o Village – Khajurani, Teh. Jaijaipur, Distt. - Janjgir – Champa (C.G.)

P.R. No. 4444/06
Presented by Shri CP Lahoti
dated 17/8/06

RE-TYPED COPY
17/8/06
CLERK to A.G. BILASPUR

COMMISSIONER
S.R. Kaushik
BILASPUR TAHSIL

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(246)

मामला क्रमांक ....W.P.:.4.4.5.7/**सन् 2006**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	25-8-2006 Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Patel, counsel for the petitioner. Miss Deepali Pandey, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents No.1 to 4, on advance copy. Heard both the counsel. By the instant writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has questioned the legality, propriety and correctness of the order dated 29-7-2006, whereby learned Additional Collector, Janjgir has rejected the prayer for staying the effect and operation of the order dated 21-7-2006 passed by the Sub Divisional Officer, Sakti. I have perused the order Annexure P-4 dated 21-7-2006 whereby the Sub Divisional Officer has quashed the appointment of the petitioner on the post of Kotwar on the ground that respondent No.7 herein was entitled for appointment on the post of Kotwar ~~on the ground~~ h e l that the Gram Panchayat has passed resolution in favour of respondent No.7 herein and also as the father of respondent No.7 was already working as Kotwar and on his retirement of attaining the age of 60 years, respondent No.7 is entitled for preferential treatment. In view of the above, respondent No.2 has not committed any illegality or infirmity in passing the impugned order. Therefore, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed and it is accordingly, dismissed, in limine. Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.3453/2006 stands disposed of. Sd/- L.C.Bhadoo Judge	

Soma

P.T.O.

30.8.06